Axiomatic and operational connections between l_1-norm of coherence and negativity

Huangjun Zhu,[1] Masahito Hayashi,[2,3] and Lin Chen[4,5]

[1] *Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, Cologne 50937, Germany**
[2] *Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, 464-8602, Japan*†
[3] *Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, 117542, Singapore*
[4] *School of Mathematics and Systems Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*
[5] *International Research Institute for Multidisciplinary Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*‡

(Dated: April 11, 2017)

Quantum coherence plays a central role in various research areas. The l_1-norm of coherence is one of the most important coherence measures that are easily computable, but it is not easy to find a simple interpretation. We show that the l_1-norm of coherence is uniquely characterized by a few simple axioms, which demonstrates in a precise sense that it is the analog of negativity in entanglement theory and sum negativity in the resource theory of magic state quantum computation. Furthermore, we provide an operational interpretation of l_1-norm of coherence as the maximum entanglement, measured by negativity, produced by (strictly) incoherent operations acting on our system and an incoherent ancilla. To achieve this goal, we clarify the relation between l_1-norm of coherence and negativity for all bipartite states, which leads to an interesting generalization of maximally correlated states.

arXiv:1704.02896v1 [quant-ph] 10 Apr 2017

Quantum coherence underlies most nonclassical phenomena characteristic of quantum physics, such as entanglement, steering, and Bell nonlocality. It is also a key resource for demonstrating quantum advantages in various information processing tasks, such as quantum metrology, quantum cryptography, and quantum computation. Recently, quantum coherence has attracted unprecedented attention fueled by the resource theoretic formulation proposed in Refs. [1, 2] and further developed in Ref. [3] among many other works; see Ref. [4] for a review.

To fully exploit the power of quantum coherence, it is crucial to employ suitable coherence measures. Although many candidates have been proposed, the l_1-norm of coherence stands out as one of the most important measures that are easily computable [2, 4, 5]. It is useful in studying speedup in quantum computation, such as in Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm [6, 7] and Grover algorithm [8–10]. It features prominently in alternative formulations of uncertainty relations, complementarity relations [5, 11–13], and wave-particle duality in multipath interferometers [5, 14–19]. It plays a crucial role in quantifying the cohering and decohering powers of quantum operations [20–22]. In addition, the l_1-norm of coherence sets an up bound for another important coherence measure, namely, the robustness of coherence [23, 24].

Despite its prominent role in the resource theory of quantum coherence, the l_1-norm of coherence has defied many attempts to find its simple interpretation. Recently, Rana et al. [25, 26] proved that the logarithmic l_1-norm of coherence is an up bound for the relative entropy of coherence, which is equal to the distillable coherence [3], and thereby argued that this measure is the analog of logarithmic negativity in entanglement theory [27–30]. While their observation is quite suggestive, their argument is not completely satisfactory, given that there are many different up bounds for the relative entropy of coherence. At this point, it should be pointed out that the logarithmic negativity is essentially the only useful entanglement measure that is easily computable for all states. It sets an upper bound for the distillable entanglement [27, 30] and a lower bound for the asymptotic exact entanglement cost under positive-partial-transpose (PPT) operations [28].

In this paper we corroborate the significance of l_1-norm of coherence by two complementary approaches. First we propose several simple axioms which single out this measure among all competitors. This approach is inspired by a similar characterization of sum negativity in the resource theory of magic state quantum computation [31–35]. The roles of negativity in quantum computation and foundational studies are a focus of ongoing research [36–44]. Our study demonstrates, in a precise sense, that l_1-norm of coherence is the analog of negativity in entanglement theory and sum negativity in the resource theory of magic state quantum computation. This analogy is indicative of the deep connections among the three prominent resource theories.

Furthermore, we provide an operational interpretation of l_1-norm of coherence as the maximum entanglement, measured by negativity, created by incoherent operations acting on the system and an incoherent ancilla. This line of thinking is inspired by a recent work of Streltsov et al. [45], which proposed a general framework for constructing coherence measures from entanglement measures [45, 46]. To achieve our goal, we show that l_1-norm of coherence is an up bound for negativity and determine all states that saturate this bound, which offer an interesting generalization of maximally correlated states [47].

Both entanglement theory and coherence theory are special examples of resource theories [3, 4, 48–50], which

* hzhu1@uni-koeln.de
† masahito@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp
‡ linchen@buaa.edu.cn

provide a unified framework for studying resource quantification and manipulations under restricted operations that are deemed free. In the case of entanglement, we are restricted to local operations and classical communication (LOCC), so only separable states can be prepared for free. In the case of coherence, we are restricted to incoherent operations, so only incoherent states are free. Recall that a state is incoherent if it is diagonal in the reference basis. A quantum operation with Kraus representation $\{K_j\}$ is incoherent if each Kraus operator K_j is incoherent in the sense that it maps every incoherent state to a subnormalized incoherent state [2–4]. The operation is strictly incoherent if in addition $K_j^\dagger$ are also incoherent [3]. For example, a unitary is incoherent if it is monomial, that is, if each column (row) has only one nonzero entry, in which case the unitary is also strictly incoherent.

Resource monotones are an essential ingredient of any resource theory. A weak monotone does not increase under nonselective free operations, while a (strong) monotone in addition does not increase on average under selective free operations. Convexity is also desirable but not always necessary; it is not assumed in this paper. A resource measure is a monotone that is nonnegative and usually vanishes on free states. Although many entanglement measures have been proposed, the negativity is distinguished because of its simplicity and versatility [27–30]. The l_1-norm of coherence in coherence theory [2, 26] and the sum negativity in the resource theory of magic state quantum computation [34] are distinguished for the same reason. All three measures have logarithmic versions, which are additive and satisfy all basic requirements of resource measures, although they are not convex.

Consider a finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with a reference orthonormal basis $\{|j\rangle\}$, the *l_1-norm of coherence* [2] of a state $\rho = \sum_{jk} \rho_{jk} |j\rangle\langle k|$ on $\mathcal{H}$ reads

$$C_{l_1}(\rho) := \sum_{j\neq k} |\rho_{jk}| = \sum_{jk} |\rho_{jk}| - 1. \tag{1}$$

It is one of the most important coherence measures that are easily computable [4, 5, 7, 9–26, 51, 52]. In addition, it sets a tight up bound for another important coherence measure, namely, the robustness of coherence $C_{\mathcal{R}}$ [23, 24]. The two measures C_{l_1} and $C_{\mathcal{R}}$ coincide on pure states and thus share the same convex roof. The logarithmic l_1-norm of coherence $C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho) := \log(1 + C_{l_1}(\rho))$ [26] is a useful coherence measure that is additive: $C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho \otimes \sigma) = C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho) + C_{\mathrm{L}}(\sigma)$ for arbitrary states ρ, σ. It is an up bound for the logarithmic robustness of coherence, which in turn up bounds the relative entropy of coherence [1, 2, 25, 26].

Now consider a bipartite system shared between Alice (A) and Bob (B); we assume that the reference basis is the tensor product of respective reference bases. The coherence measures mentioned above are defined in the same way as before. Now the l_1-norm of coherence up bounds not only the robustness of coherence but also the robustness of entanglement. In addition, the logarithmic l_1-norm of coherence up bounds the relative entropy of coherence and relative entropy of entanglement.

Here we are interested in another useful entanglement measure that has no obvious analog in coherence theory. The *negativity* of ρ [27, 29, 30] is defined as

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho) := \mathrm{tr}\,|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}| - 1 = \|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}\|_1 - 1, \tag{2}$$

where $\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}$ denotes the partial transpose of ρ with respect to subsystem A, and $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the Schatten 1-norm (or trace norm). Note that the definition in some literature differs by a factor of two. As an example, consider $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ with $|\psi\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j}|jj\rangle$, we have

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho) = \sum_{j\neq k} \sqrt{\lambda_j \lambda_k} = \left(\sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j}\right)^2 - 1. \tag{3}$$

It is worth pointing out that the negativity of a pure state is equal to the robustness of entanglement, so the two measures share the same convex roof. The logarithmic negativity $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho) := \log(1 + \mathcal{N}(\rho))$ sets an upper bound for the distillable entanglement [27, 29, 30] and a lower bound for the asymptotic exact entanglement cost under PPT operations. Moreover, the latter bound is tight when $|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}|^{\mathrm{T_A}} \geq 0$ [28].

Now we are ready to reveal the axiomatic connections between l_1-norm of coherence and negativity as well as sum negativity.

Theorem 1 (Uniqueness of l_1-norm of coherence). Suppose $C(\rho)$ is a weak coherence monotone that is a symmetric function of the absolute values of nonzero off-diagonal entries of ρ. Then $C(\rho)$ is a nondecreasing function of $C_{l_1}(\rho)$. If in addition it is additive, then $C(\rho) = c\, C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho)$ for some constant $c \geq 0$.

Theorem 2 (Uniqueness of negativity). Suppose $E(\rho)$ is a weak entanglement monotone that is a symmetric function of the negative eigenvalues of $\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}$. Then $E(\rho)$ is a nondecreasing function of $\mathcal{N}(\rho)$. If in addition it is additive, then $E(\rho) = c\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho)$ for some constant $c \geq 0$.

Recall that a weak monotone does not increase under nonselective free operations. A function is symmetric if it is invariant under arbitrary permutations of its arguments. Here we implicitly assume that $C(\rho \otimes \sigma) = C(\rho)$ for any incoherent state σ, which can be prepared for free; this assumption is more intuitive when C is additive. Similarly, $E(\rho \otimes \sigma) = E(\rho)$ for any separable state σ. Remarkably, both l_1-norm of coherence and negativity can be uniquely characterized by such simple axioms. In addition, Theorem 1 still holds if free operations are strictly incoherent. We note that a similar uniqueness theorem has been established for sum negativity in the resource theory of magic state quantum computation [34]. Our two theorems share the same spirit with Theorem 6 in Ref. [34], and their proofs are also similar, so we only prove Theorem 1 as an example. Although the logarithmic sum negativity (referred to as mana in Ref. [34])

was not uniquely characterized as in Theorems 1 and 2 previously, the analogous result follows from a similar argument presented below.

Proof of Theorem 1. Suppose two quantum states ρ and ρ' satisfy $C_{l_1}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho')$. If $C_{l_1}(\rho) = 0$, then ρ, ρ' have no nonzero off-diagonal entries, so $C(\rho) = C(\rho')$ by assumption. Otherwise, suppose the absolute values of nonzero off-diagonal entries of ρ are given by $a_0, a_1, \ldots a_r$, and that of ρ' are given by $b_0, b_1, \ldots b_s$. Let $\sigma \widehat{=} \mathrm{diag}(a_0, a_1, \ldots a_r)/C_{l_1}(\rho)$ and $\sigma' \widehat{=} \mathrm{diag}(b_0, b_1, \ldots b_s)/C_{l_1}(\rho)$; then σ, σ' represent incoherent quantum states. In addition, the set of absolute values of nonzero off-diagonal entries of $\rho \otimes \sigma'$ is the same as that of $\rho' \otimes \sigma$. Therefore, $C(\rho \otimes \sigma') = C(\rho' \otimes \sigma)$ by assumption, which further implies that $C(\rho) = C(\rho')$ given that σ, σ' are incoherent. This conclusion shows that $C(\rho)$ is a function of $C_{l_1}(\rho)$ and thus also a function of $C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho)$.

Suppose $C_{l_1}(\rho') \geq C_{l_1}(\rho)$, then we can find a state σ such that $C_{l_1}(\rho \otimes \sigma) = C_{l_1}(\rho') \geq C_{l_1}(\rho)$. Therefore, $C(\rho') = C(\rho \otimes \sigma) \geq C(\rho)$, given that C is a function of C_{l_1} and that it is monotonic under incoherent operations.

If C is also additive, then $C(\rho^{\otimes k}) = kC(\rho)$ for any ρ and any positive integer k, which implies that $C(\rho) \geq 0$. If ρ is incoherent, then we have $2C(\rho) = C(\rho^{\otimes 2}) = C(\rho)$, which implies that $C(\rho) = 0$. Choose ϱ with $C_{\mathrm{L}}(\varrho) = 1$; if C is not identically zero, multiply C by a positive constant if necessary, we may assume that $C(\varrho) = 1$. Consequently $C(\varrho^{\otimes k}) = k = C_{\mathrm{L}}(\varrho^{\otimes k})$. Therefore, $C(\rho) = C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho)$ whenever $C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho)$ is an integer.

Given any positive rational number n/m as the ratio of two positive integers, we can construct a quantum state σ with $C_{\mathrm{L}}(\sigma) = n/m$, so that $C_{\mathrm{L}}(\sigma^{\otimes m}) = n$. Therefore, $mC(\sigma) = C(\sigma^{\otimes m}) = C_{\mathrm{L}}(\sigma^{\otimes m}) = n$. It follows that $C(\rho) = C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho)$ whenever $C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho)$ is a rational number. Finally the restriction to the rational numbers can be eliminated given that $C(\rho)$ is nondecreasing with $C_{\mathrm{L}}(\rho)$ and coincides with the latter on a dense subset. Interestingly, C is automatically continuous and strongly monotonic given the extra additivity assumption. This observation completes the proof of Theorem 1. □

Next, we clarify the operational connection between $\mathcal{N}(\rho)$ and $C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

Theorem 3.

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho) \leq C_{l_1}(\rho) \quad \forall \rho. \tag{4}$$

The inequality is saturated iff $\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}$ has the form

$$\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}} = \sum_{jk} a_{jk} |jk\rangle\langle\pi(jk)|, \tag{5}$$

where π is a product of disjoint transpositions. We may assume that $\pi(jk) = jk$ whenever $a_{jk} = 0$; each transposition $(jk, j'k')$ satisfies $j \neq j'$ and $k \neq k'$; in addition, jk' and $j'k$ are fixed points of π when $(jk, j'k')$ is such a transposition.

Recall that a transposition is a special permutation that interchanges two elements, while leaving others invariant. The proof of Theorem 3 is presented in the appendix. Here we mention that Eq. (4) is an immediate consequence of the equalities $C_{l_1}(\rho) = \|\rho\|_{l_1} - 1 = \|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}\|_{l_1} - 1$, $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}\|_1 - 1$ and Lemma 1 below (also proved in the appendix), where $\|\cdot\|_{l_1}$ denotes the l_1-norm.

Lemma 1. Every matrix X satisfies $\|X\|_1 \leq \|X\|_{l_1}$; the inequality is saturated iff X has the following form

$$X = \sum_j s_j |j\rangle\langle\pi(j)|, \tag{6}$$

where s_j are complex numbers, and π is a permutation.

Note that the permutation π in Eq. (6) may be subjected to additional constraints so as to comply with the numbers of rows and columns of X. The equality condition in Eq. (6) is closely related to the singular value decomposition of X. After deriving Lemma 1, we realized that the inequality $\|X\|_1 \leq \|X\|_{l_1}$ follows from Theorem 3.32 in Ref. [53], but we have not found any reference that derived the equality condition.

Those states saturating the inequality $\mathcal{N}(\rho) \leq C_{l_1}(\rho)$ in Eq. (4) are called *pairing states*, given that every transposition is determined by a pair of basis states and vice versa. Theorem 3 demands that pairing is monogamous; that is, every basis state can be paired with at most one other basis state. Moreover, some basis states must remain as bachelors. The *pairing number* of such a state ρ is the number of transpositions in the disjoint cycle decomposition of π in Theorem 3. This number is well defined because the requirement $\pi(jk) = jk$ whenever $a_{jk} = 0$ ensures that the permutation π is uniquely determined by the state ρ. Actually, the pairing number of ρ is equal to half the number of nonzero off-diagonal entries. Note that a pairing state is entangled iff the pairing number is nonzero.

For example, the bound in Eq. (4) is saturated by any pure state of the form $|\psi\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j}|jj\rangle$; see Eq. (3). The pairing number of $|\psi\rangle$ is equal to $r(r-1)/2$, where r is the Schmidt rank of $|\psi\rangle$. In addition, the bound is saturated by a *maximally correlated state* [3, 45, 47], which has the following form

$$\rho = \sum_{jk} a_{jk} |jj\rangle\langle kk|. \tag{7}$$

This claim can be verified by straightforward calculation,

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho) = \sum_{j \neq k} |a_{jk}|. \tag{8}$$

The pairing number of ρ is equal to half the number of nonzero coefficients a_{jk} with $j \neq k$. The bound in Eq. (4) is still saturated if ρ is subjected to a local incoherent unitary transformation; the resulting state is also called

maximally correlated in this paper. Here a local incoherent unitary is the tensor product of incoherent unitaries for respective subsystems. It should also be pointed out that any bipartite pure state is equivalent to a maximally correlated state under local unitary transformations, not necessarily incoherent.

In general, pairing states do not have to be maximally correlated. Nevertheless, those with the maximal pairing number are when $\dim(\mathcal{H}_{\rm A}) = \dim(\mathcal{H}_{\rm B})$.

Theorem 4. Let ρ be a pairing state on $\mathcal{H}_{\rm A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\rm B}$ with $d_{\rm A} := \dim(\mathcal{H}_{\rm A}) = \dim(\mathcal{H}_{\rm B})$. Then the pairing number of ρ is at most $d_{\rm A}(d_{\rm A}-1)/2$, and the upper bound is saturated only if ρ is maximally correlated.

Proof. Note that ρ and $\rho^{\rm T_A}$ have the same numbers of nonzero diagonal entries and off-diagonal entries. Suppose ρ is a pairing state with pairing number m. Then both ρ and $\rho^{\rm T_A}$ have $2m$ nonzero off-diagonal entries; meanwhile the number of nonzero entries is at most $d_{\rm A}^2$ according to Theorem 3. Suppose ρ has n nonzero diagonal entries. Then $2m \le n(n-1)$ and $2m+n \le d_{\rm A}^2$, which imply that $m \le d_{\rm A}(d_{\rm A}-1)/2$. If the inequality is saturated, then $n = d_{\rm A}$, and ρ has the following form

$$\rho = \sum_{r,s=0}^{d_{\rm A}-1} a_{rs} |j_r k_r\rangle\langle j_s k_s|, \tag{9}$$

where $a_{rs} \neq 0$ for all r, s, and $(j_s, k_s) \neq (j_r, k_r)$ whenever $r \neq s$. Now Theorem 3 further implies that $j_s \neq j_r$ and $k_s \neq k_r$ whenever $r \neq s$, so that ρ is maximally correlated. □

Corollary 1. A two-qubit state ρ satisfies the equality $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ iff ρ is diagonal or maximally correlated.

Corollary 2. A bipartite state on $\mathcal{H}_{\rm A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\rm B}$ with $\dim(\mathcal{H}_{\rm A}) = 2$ satisfies $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$ iff ρ has the form

$$\rho = \bigoplus_{j\ge 0}^{t} p_j \rho_j, \tag{10}$$

where $t \le \dim(\mathcal{H}_{\rm B})/2$, $p_j \ge 0$, $\sum_j p_j = 1$, $\mathrm{tr}_{\rm A}(\rho_j)$ have mutually orthogonal supports, ρ_0 is diagonal, and ρ_j for each $j \ge 1$ is maximally correlated.

Corollary 1 is an immediate consequence of Theorems 3 and 4. It is also a special case of Corollary 2.

Proof of Corollary 2. If ρ is given in Eq. (10), then $\rho^{\rm T_A} = \bigoplus_{j\ge 0}^{t} p_j \rho_j^{\rm T_A}$, so that $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \sum_j p_j \mathcal{N}(\rho_j) = \sum_j p_j C_{l_1}(\rho_j) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

If $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$, then ρ can be written as follows according to Theorem 3,

$$\rho = \sum_s \Big(a_s |0j_s\rangle\langle 0j_s| + b_s |0k_s\rangle\langle 1j_s| + b_s^* |1j_s\rangle\langle 0k_s| + c_s |1k_s\rangle\langle 1k_s| \Big) + \sum_r a_r' |0j_r'\rangle\langle 0j_r'| + c_r' |1k_r'\rangle\langle 1k_r'|, \tag{11}$$

where all j_s, k_s, j_r', k_r' are distinct. Therefore, ρ has the form of Eq. (10) with constraints as specified. □

Corollary 2 fails when $\dim(\mathcal{H}_{\rm A}) \ge 3$. One counterexample is $\rho = \frac{1}{4}(|02\rangle\langle 02| + |20\rangle\langle 20| + |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|)$, where $|\psi\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\varphi\rangle = (|11\rangle + |22\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$.

Recently Streltsov et al. introduced a general framework for constructing coherence measures based on the maximum entanglement produced by incoherent operations acting on the system and an incoherent ancilla [45]. More precisely, given any entanglement measure E, one can define a coherence measure C_E as follows,

$$C_E(\rho) := \lim_{d_{\rm A}\to\infty} \left\{ \sup_{\Lambda_{\rm i}} E\left(\Lambda_{\rm i}\left[\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right]\right) \right\}. \tag{12}$$

Here $d_{\rm A}$ denotes the dimension of the ancilla, and the supremum is over all operations $\Lambda_{\rm i}$ that are incoherent. It turns out that $C_E(\rho)$ coincides with the relative entropy of coherence when E is the relative entropy of entanglement; an analogous conclusion holds when E is the geometric entanglement [45]. Moreover, a one-to-one mapping can be established between coherence measures and entanglement measures that are based on convex roof [46]. However, the situation is not clear for coherence measures induced by some other important entanglement measures.

Here we are concerned with the measure induced by negativity

$$C_{\mathcal{N}}(\rho) := \lim_{d_{\rm A}\to\infty} \left\{ \sup_{\Lambda_{\rm i}} \mathcal{N}\left(\Lambda_{\rm i}\left[\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right]\right) \right\} \tag{13}$$

and the analog $C_{\mathcal{N}_{\rm L}}(\rho)$ induced by logarithmic negativity.

Theorem 5.

$$C_{\mathcal{N}}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho) \quad \forall \rho, \tag{14}$$

$$C_{\mathcal{N}_{\rm L}}(\rho) = C_{\rm L}(\rho) = \log(1 + C_{l_1}(\rho)) \quad \forall \rho. \tag{15}$$

Theorem 5 offers an operational interpretation of l_1-norm of coherence as the maximum entanglement, measured by negativity, produced by incoherence operations acting on the system and an incoherent ancilla. A similar interpretation applies to the logarithmic l_1-norm of coherence. Compared with known connections between l_1-norm of coherence and negativity, the one established here is much more precise. In addition, by virtue of Ref. [46], it is easy to show that Eq. (14) still holds if C_{l_1} and $\mathcal{N}$ are replaced by their respective convex roofs $\hat{C}_{l_1}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{N}}$, that is, $C_{\hat{\mathcal{N}}}(\rho) = \hat{C}_{l_1}(\rho)$. Similarly, $C_{\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{\rm L}}(\rho) = \hat{C}_{\rm L}$. These relations further corroborate the connections between l_1-norm of coherence and negativity.

Proof. Note that Eq. (15) is a direct consequence of Eq. (14), so it suffices to prove the latter. The inequality $C_{\mathcal{N}}(\rho) \le C_{l_1}(\rho)$ follows from the equation

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{N}\left(\Lambda_{\rm i}\left[\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right]\right) \le C_{l_1}\left(\Lambda_{\rm i}\left[\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right]\right) \\ &\le C_{l_1}\left(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right) = C_{l_1}(\rho) \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

for any incoherent operation $\Lambda_{\rm i}$, where the two inequalities follow from Theorem 3 and the monotonicity of C_{l_1}, respectively.

To prove the converse inequality $C_{\mathcal{N}}(\rho) \geq C_{l_1}(\rho)$, assume that the ancilla has the same dimension as the system under consideration, so we can construct the generalized CNOT gate

$$U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}|jk\rangle = |j(j+k)\rangle, \tag{17}$$

which is strictly incoherent. Given $\rho = \sum_{jk} \rho_{jk}|j\rangle\langle k|$, the state

$$\rho_{\mathrm{MC}} := U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}\left(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|\right) U_{\mathrm{CNOT}}^{\dagger} = \sum_{jk} \rho_{jk}|jj\rangle\langle kk|$$

is maximally correlated [3, 45, 47]. Observing that

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho_{\mathrm{MC}}) = C_{l_1}(\rho_{\mathrm{MC}}) = C_{l_1}(\rho), \tag{18}$$

we conclude that $C_{\mathcal{N}}(\rho) \geq C_{l_1}(\rho)$, which confirms Eq. (14) given the opposite inequality. □

In summary we proposed an axiomatic characterization of l_1-norm of coherence, which reveals a precise analogy between this measure and negativity in entanglement theory as well as sum negativity in the resource theory of magic state quantum computation. In addition, we provided an operational interpretation of l_1-norm of coherence as the maximum entanglement, measured by negativity, created by (strictly) incoherent operations acting on the system and an incoherent ancilla. Similar interpretations also apply to the logarithmic l_1-norm of coherence and its convex roof. In the course of study, we clarified the relation between l_1-norm of coherence and negativity for all bipartite states and proposed pairing states as an interesting generalization of maximally correlated states.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

HZ acknowledges financial support from the Excellence Initiative of the German Federal and State Governments (ZUK 81) and the DFG. MH was supported in part by a JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) No. 16KT0017 and Kayamori Foundation of Informational Science Advancement. LC was supported by Beijing Natural Science Foundation (4173076), the NNSF of China (Grant No. 11501024), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant Nos. 29816133 and 74026601).

Appendix A: Proof of Theorem 3

Proof of Theorem 3. The bound $\mathcal{N}(\rho) \leq C_{l_1}(\rho)$ follows from the equation below,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}(\rho) + 1 &= \mathrm{tr}\,|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}| = \|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}\|_1 \leq \|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}\|_{l_1} = \|\rho\|_{l_1} \\ &= C_{l_1}(\rho) + 1,\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

where the inequality follows from Lemma 1. If $\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}$ has the form in Eq. (5), then the inequality is saturated according to the same lemma, which can also be verified directly, so that $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$.

On the other hand, suppose $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = C_{l_1}(\rho)$; then $\|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}\|_1 = \|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}\|_{l_1}$, so that $\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}$ has the form in Eq. (5) according to Lemma 1, where π is a permutation. If $a_{jk} = 0$, then all entries of $\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}$ in the row labeled by jk are zero, so are all entries in the column labeled by jk, given that ρ and $\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}$ are Hermitian. Therefore, we may assume $\pi(jk) = jk$ without loss of generality. Let τ be the restriction of π on those basis states with $a_{jk} \neq 0$. Recall that every permutation can be written as the product of disjoint cycles. If τ has a cycle of length at least 3, then $\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}$ cannot be Hermitian. Therefore, each cycle in the disjoint cycle decomposition has length at most 2; in other words, τ is a product of disjoint transpositions (including the identity, which corresponds to no transposition), and the same holds for π.

Suppose $(jk, j'k')$ is a transposition in the disjoint cycle decomposition of τ. Then $a_{j'k'} = a_{jk}^* \neq 0$, and $\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}$ has the form

$$\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}} = a_{jk}|jk\rangle\langle j'k'| + a_{jk}^*|j'k'\rangle\langle jk| + M, \tag{A2}$$

where M is a Hermitian operator whose support is orthogonal to $|jk\rangle$ and $|j'k'\rangle$. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho(|jk'\rangle\langle j'k|)] = \mathrm{tr}[\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}(|j'k'\rangle\langle jk|)] = a_{jk} \neq 0, \tag{A3}$$

which implies that $\langle j'k|\rho^{\mathrm{T_A}}|j'k\rangle = \langle j'k|\rho|j'k\rangle > 0$ given that ρ is positive semidefinite. Consequently, $a_{j'k} > 0$ and $\tau(j'k) = j'k$; by the same token $a_{jk'} > 0$ and $\tau(jk') = jk'$. In particular, jk' and $j'k$ are fixed points of τ. If $j = j'$ or $k = k'$, then $\tau(jk) = jk$, which contradicts the assumption that τ exchanges jk and $j'k'$. Therefore, $j \neq j'$ and $k \neq k'$ whenever $(jk, j'k')$ is a transposition in the disjoint cycle decomposition of τ or π. □

Appendix B: Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Our proof is based on the theory of majorization [46, 54–56]. Let $x = (x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1})^{\mathrm{T}}$ and $y = (y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_{d-1})^{\mathrm{T}}$ be two d-dimensional real vectors. The vector x is majorized by y if

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} x_j^{\downarrow} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k} y_j^{\downarrow} \quad \forall k = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1,$$

and the inequality is saturated when $k = d-1$. Here $x^{\downarrow}$ is constructed from x by arranging its components in decreasing order. This relation is written as $x \prec y$ or $y \succ x$ henceforth. It can also be defined for vectors of different dimensions, in which case we implicitly add a number of "0" to the vector with few components so as to match the other vector.

Suppose $X = \sum_{j,k} X_{jk}|j\rangle\langle k|$. Define column vectors $u = (|X_{jk}|^2)_{jk}$, $v = \mathrm{diag}(X^{\dagger}X)$, and $w = \mathrm{eig}(X^{\dagger}X)$,

where $\mathrm{eig}(X^\dagger X)$ denotes the vector composed of the eigenvalues of $X^\dagger X$. Then it is straightforward to verify that

$$u \prec v \prec w, \tag{B1}$$

where the second inequality is well known in matrix analysis [55]. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\|X\|_1 &= \sum_j \sqrt{w_j} \le \sum_j \sqrt{v_j} \le \sum_{jk} \sqrt{u_{jk}} \\ &= \sum_{jk} |X_{jk}| = \|X\|_{l_1}.\end{aligned} \tag{B2}$$

Here the two inequalities follow from Eq. (B1) and the fact that the function $\sum_j \sqrt{w_j}$ is Schur concave in w. Actually, the function is strictly Schur concave, so $w \simeq v \simeq u$ whenever the two inequalities are saturated, which amounts to the equality $\|X\|_1 = \|X\|_{l_1}$. Here $v \simeq u$ means $v \prec u$ and $u \prec v$; that is, u and v have the same nonzero components up to permutations. In that case, the number of nonzero entries of X is equal to the number of nonzero singular values, that is, the rank of X. In addition, each row of X has at most one nonzero entry, and so does each column. Consequently, X has the form of Eq. (6), in which case the inequality $\|X\|_1 \le \|X\|_{l_1}$ is indeed saturated. □

Appendix C: Alternative proof of the inequality $\|X\|_1 \le \|X\|_{l_1}$

Proof. Let $X = \sum_j s_j |u_j\rangle\langle v_j|$ be the singular value decomposition of X, where $s_j > 0$ are singular values of X, $|u_j\rangle$ are orthonormal, and so are $|v_j\rangle$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|X\|_1 &= \sum_j s_j = \sum_j |\langle u_j|X|v_j\rangle| = \sum_j \left|\sum_{k,l} u_{jk}^* X_{kl} v_{jl}\right| \\ &\le \sum_{j,k,l} |X_{kl}||u_{jk}^* v_{jl}| \le \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k,l} |X_{kl}| \left(|u_{jk}|^2 + |v_{jl}|^2\right) \\ &\le \sum_{k,l} |X_{kl}| = \|X\|_{l_1}.\end{aligned} \tag{C1}$$

Here the third inequality follows from the fact that $\sum_j |u_{jk}|^2 \le 1$ and $\sum_j |v_{jl}|^2 \le 1$, given that $|u_j\rangle$ and $|v_j\rangle$ are respectively orthonormal. □

[1] J. Aberg, "Quantifying Superposition," (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0612146.

[2] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, "Quantifying coherence," Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).

[3] A. Winter and D. Yang, "Operational resource theory of coherence," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 120404 (2016).

[4] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, and M. B. Plenio, "Quantum Coherence as a Resource," (2017), arXiv:1609.02439.

[5] M.-L. Hu, X. Hu, Y. Peng, Y.-R. Zhang, and H. Fan, "Quantum coherence and quantum correlations," (2017), arXiv:1703.01852.

[6] D. Deutsch and R. Jozsa, "Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation," Proc. R. Soc. A **439**, 553–558 (1992).

[7] M. Hillery, "Coherence as a resource in decision problems: The Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm and a variation," Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012111 (2016).

[8] L. K. Grover, "A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC'96 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1996) pp. 212–219.

[9] H.-L. Shi, S.-Y. Liu, X.-H. Wang, W.-L. Yang, Z.-Y. Yang, and H. Fan, "Coherence depletion in the Grover quantum search algorithm," Phys. Rev. A **95**, 032307 (2017).

[10] N. Anand and A. K. Pati, "Coherence and Entanglement Monogamy in the Discrete Analogue of Analog Grover Search," (2016), arXiv:1611.04542.

[11] S. Cheng and M. J. W. Hall, "Complementarity relations for quantum coherence," Phys. Rev. A **92**, 042101 (2015).

[12] U. Singh, M. N. Bera, H. S. Dhar, and A. K. Pati, "Maximally coherent mixed states: Complementarity between maximal coherence and mixedness," Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052115 (2015).

[13] X. Yuan, G. Bai, T. Peng, and X. Ma, "Quantum uncertainty relation of coherence," (2016), arXiv:1612.02573.

[14] K. von Prillwitz, L. Rudnicki, and F. Mintert, "Contrast in multipath interference and quantum coherence," Phys. Rev. A **92**, 052114 (2015).

[15] M. N. Bera, T. Qureshi, M. A. Siddiqui, and A. K. Pati, "Duality of quantum coherence and path distinguishability," Phys. Rev. A **92**, 012118 (2015).

[16] E. Bagan, J. A. Bergou, S. S. Cottrell, and M. Hillery, "Relations between coherence and path information," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 160406 (2016).

[17] T. Biswas, M. García Díaz, and A. Winter, "Interferometric visibility and coherence," (2017), arXiv:1701.05051.

[18] Y. Yuan, Z. Hou, Y.-Y. Zhao, H.-S. Zhong, G.-Y. Xiang, C.-F. Li, and G.-C. Guo, "Experimental demonstration of wave-particle duality relation based on coherence measure," (2017), arXiv:1702.06308.

[19] J. Gao, Z.-Q. Jiao, C.-Q. Hu, L.-F. Qiao, R.-J. Ren, Z.-H. Ma, S.-M. Fei, V. Vedral, and X.-M. Jin, "Experimental Test of Relation between Coherence and Path Information," (2017), arXiv:1703.08026.

[20] A. Mani and V. Karimipour, "Cohering and decohering power of quantum channels," Phys. Rev. A **92**, 032331 (2015).

[21] K. Bu, A. Kumar, L. Zhang, and J. Wu, "Cohering power of quantum operations," (2017), arXiv:1509.09109.

[22] M. García-Díaz, D. Egloff, and M. B. Plenio, "A note on coherence power of N-dimensional unitary operators," Quant. Inf. Comp. **16**, 1282–1294 (2016).

[23] C. Napoli, T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, M. Piani, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, "Robustness of coherence: An operational and observable measure of quantum coherence," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 150502 (2016).

[24] M. Piani, M. Cianciaruso, T. R. Bromley, C. Napoli, N. Johnston, and G. Adesso, "Robustness of asymmetry and coherence of quantum states," Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042107 (2016).

[25] S. Rana, P. Parashar, and M. Lewenstein, "Trace-distance measure of coherence," Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012110 (2016).

[26] S. Rana, P. Parashar, A. Winter, and M. Lewenstein, "Logarithmic Coherence: Operational Interpretation of ℓ_1-norm Coherence," (2017), arXiv:1612.09234.

[27] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, "Computable measure of entanglement," Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032314 (2002).

[28] K. Audenaert, M. B. Plenio, and J. Eisert, "Entanglement cost under positive-partial-transpose-preserving operations," Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 027901 (2003).

[29] M. B. Plenio, "Logarithmic negativity: A full entanglement monotone that is not convex," Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 090503 (2005).

[30] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, "Quantum entanglement," Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).

[31] S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, "Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas," Phys. Rev. A **71**, 022316 (2005).

[32] V. Veitch, C. Ferrie, D. Gross, and J. Emerson, "Negative quasi-probability as a resource for quantum computation," New J. Phys. **14**, 113011 (2012).

[33] A. Mari and J. Eisert, "Positive Wigner functions render classical simulation of quantum computation efficient," Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 230503 (2012).

[34] V. Veitch, S. A. H. Mousavian, D. Gottesman, and J. Emerson, "The resource theory of stabilizer quantum computation," New J. Phys. **16**, 013009 (2014).

[35] M. Howard and E. Campbell, "Application of a resource theory for magic states to fault-tolerant quantum computing," Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 090501 (2017).

[36] A. Kenfack and K. Życzkowski, "Negativity of the Wigner function as an indicator of non-classicality," J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **6**, 396 (2004).

[37] D. Gross, "Hudson's theorem for finite-dimensional quantum systems," J. Math. Phys. **47**, 122107 (2006).

[38] R. W. Spekkens, "Negativity and contextuality are equivalent notions of nonclassicality," Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 020401 (2008).

[39] C. Ferrie, "Quasi-probability representations of quantum theory with applications to quantum information science," Rep. Prog. Phys. **74**, 116001 (2011).

[40] M. Howard, J. Wallman, V. Veitch, and J. Emerson, "Contextuality supplies the 'magic' for quantum computation," Nature **510**, 351–355 (2014).

[41] N. Delfosse, P. Allard Guerin, J. Bian, and R. Raussendorf, "Wigner function negativity and contextuality in quantum computation on rebits," Phys. Rev. X **5**, 021003 (2015).

[42] H. Pashayan, J. J. Wallman, and S. D. Bartlett, "Estimating outcome probabilities of quantum circuits using quasiprobabilities," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 070501 (2015).

[43] H. Zhu, "Quasiprobability representations of quantum mechanics with minimal negativity," Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 120404 (2016).

[44] J. B. DeBrota and C. A. Fuchs, "Negativity Bounds for Weyl-Heisenberg Quasiprobability Representations," (2017), arXiv:1703.08272.

[45] A. Streltsov, U. Singh, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, and G. Adesso, "Measuring quantum coherence with entanglement," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 020403 (2015).

[46] H. Zhu, Z. Ma, Z. Cao, S.-M. Fei, and V. Vedral, "Operational one-to-one mapping between coherence and entanglement measures," (2017), arXiv:1704.01935.

[47] E. M. Rains, "Bound on distillable entanglement," Phys. Rev. A **60**, 179–184 (1999).

[48] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, "(Quantumness in the context of) resource theories," Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1345019 (2013).

[49] F. G. S. L. Brandão and G. Gour, "Reversible framework for quantum resource theories," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 070503 (2015).

[50] B. Coecke, T. Fritz, and R. W. Spekkens, "A mathematical theory of resources," Information and Computation **250**, 59–86 (2016).

[51] X. Hu and H. Fan, "Extracting quantum coherence via steering," Sci. Rep. **6**, 34380 (2016).

[52] X. Qi, T. Gao, and F. Yan, "Coherence concurrence," (2017), arXiv:1610.07052.

[53] X. Zhan, *Matrix Inequalities*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 1790 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002).

[54] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and its Applications*, 2nd ed., Springer Series in Statistics (Springer, New York, 2011).

[55] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis* (Springer, New York, 1997).

[56] M. A. Nielsen, "Conditions for a class of entanglement transformations," Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 436–439 (1999).